

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain in the application. Of these, the Examiner's "Summary of Action" indicates that claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-20 stand rejected, while claims 6 and 10 stand objected to. However, applicants can find no rejection of claim 13 (only an objection); and applicants can find no objection to claims 6 and 10. The Examiner's 5/10/2005 Office Action is therefore believed to be incomplete.

In addition to the amendments mentioned in the following sections of these Remarks/Arguments, applicants note that claim 9 has been amended to change "KQ dielectrics" to "ceramic dielectrics". Also, claim 10 has been amended to change its dependency in light of the amendment to claim 9. Support for these amendments is found, at least, in paragraph [0024].

Claim 19 has been amended to change "KQ dielectrics" to "KQ CL-90-7858 dielectrics". Support for this amendment is also found, at least, in paragraph [0024].

The above amendments are not believed to add new matter.

1. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objects to paragraph [0001] of the specification because the statuses of referenced patent applications need to be updated. These updates have been provided.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [0016] of the specification because he believes the phrase "is shielded 106, 108" is an incomplete recitation. Applicants disagree. The reference numbers 106 and 108 are provided as indicators of what it is that provides the referenced 'shielding'. Applicants' sentence could have alternately been written to say, "As defined herein, a quasi-coax transmission line 100 comprises a conductor 104, the cross-section of which is shielded (e.g., by shields 106, 108) in a non-symmetrical fashion." However, applicants believe their original sentence is also proper.

The Examiner objects to paragraphs [0021] and [0024] because he would prefer to see figure references in these paragraphs. Because applicants believe the insertion of figure references would in no way change the scope of their original description, applicants have inserted such references for the Examiner's convenience.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [0025] because he believes phrases such as "deposited 902" should be rewritten as "deposited by step 902". However, applicants believe such changes are unnecessary, and that such changes are not mandated by the MPEP. As a result, applicants have not made these changes.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure, in general, because some reference numbers referred to in the application are referred to in terms of ranges of reference numbers, and all of the reference numbers in the referenced ranges do not exist. Although applicants' representative has used this convention for over a decade, and the USPTO has not objected to it, applicants' specification has been amended to list all of the reference numbers that were included within the referenced ranges.

The Examiner further objects to the disclosure because, "the following reference labels need description relative to the corresponding figure: fig. 4 (200, 202, 210, 212, 218), fig. 8, all reference labels therein". See, 5/10/2005 Office Action, p. 2. Applicants do not understand the Examiner's request. If the Examiner is requesting a description of each referenced structure (e.g., structure 200) in the context of each of applicants' figures, applicants assert that this is unnecessary, because a reference number appearing in two or more figures is presumed to reference the same structure. Providing a description of the structure in the context of each figure (when the structure is the same) would be duplicative.

The Examiner also objects to the disclosure because the trademark "DuPont" should be capitalized. This change has been made.

All of the above amendments to the specification are believed to be clerical in nature, and none are believed to add new matter.

2. Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objects to claim 20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

...it is unclear whether "each of the dielectrics" is intended for each "mound" of dielectric or for each "mound" of dielectric and the "dielectric layer".

5/10/2005 Office Action, p. 3.

Although applicants believe it is clear that "each of the dielectrics" includes both the "layer of dielectric" and the "mounds of dielectric", applicants have amended claim 20 to clarify this fact.

The Examiner also objects to claim 13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claim's recitation of "DUPONT® QG150" makes the claim indefinite. Although applicants disagree, the limitation "DuPont® QG150 gold" has been replaced with the limitation "a thickfilm conductive paste". Claim 13, as amended, is believed to be broader than the original claim 13.

With respect to claims 8, 9, 11 and 14, the Examiner asserts that the definite article "the" should be inserted before each mention of a previously introduced element (e.g., "the layer of dielectric and the dielectric mounds" instead of "the layer of dielectric and dielectric mounds"). Applicants disagree, and believe that both conventions are proper. However, to speed prosecution, applicants have made the requested changes.

With respect to claims 14, 15 and 19, the Examiner has requested the insertion of "respective" in various locations. In response, applicants have inserted the word "respective" before the word "mounds" in claim 15 at b). This amendment is believed to clarify the fact that a *plurality* of "mounds of dielectric" exist. However, applicants have not inserted the word "respective" in other locations, as applicants do

not believe that these additional amendments would serve any sort of clarifying purpose, and applicants believe that proper antecedent basis for "thickfilms" (in claim 14) and "mounds of dielectric" (in claims 15 and 19) already exists.

All of the above amendments to the claims are believed to be clerical in nature, and none are believed to add new matter.

3. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Arledge et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,000,120; hereinafter "Arledge") or Shimada et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,189; hereinafter "Shimada") in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,357,138).

The Examiner asserts that:

... Arledge et al and Shimada et al (figs. 9-13) each pertain to shielded coaxial line structures comprising: ... a dielectric layer (312, in Arledge et al; 33 in Shimada et al). . . ; a dielectric mound or layer (342 in Arledge et al; 34 in Shimada et al); and an upper shielding layer (382) in Arledge et al; 36 in Shimada et al) deposited over the dielectric mound. . . However, each primary reference differs from the claimed invention in that plural shielded coaxial arrangements are not disclosed.

Kobayashi discloses plural shielded coaxial wiring patterns in a multi-layer structure of the type analogous to those in Arledge et al or Shimada et al. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have modified the shielded coaxial structures in either Arledge et al or Shimada et al to have respectively included a plurality of such shield [sic] coaxial structures in view of the exemplary teaching thereof by Kobayashi. . .

5/10/2005 Office Action, pp. 4-5.

Although the Examiner admits that Arledge and Shimada fail to teach "plural shielded coaxial arrangements", the Examiner also asserts that each teaches "a dielectric mound or layer". Applicants note that a plurality of "dielectric mounds" is not equivalent to a "dielectric layer".

With respect to Kobayashi's teaching of plural shielded coaxial wires, applicants

disagree that it would have been obvious to merge Kobayashi's teachings with those of Arledge or Shimada, in the precise manner that the Examiner suggests.

With respect to Arledge, applicants note that Arledge discloses only a single conductor 332 sandwiched between two dielectrics 312, 342 (see FIG. 3). In light of Kobayashi's teachings, applicants believe that, even if one of ordinary skill in the art *might* have been motivated to replicate the formation of Arledge's dielectric/conductor unit 312, 332, 342 multiple times on a single substrate, there is absolutely no teaching within Arledge or Kobayashi to 1) extend the dielectric 312 of Arledge so that it is capable of supporting multiple conductors 332, or 2) replace *only the lower ones* of Kobayashi's dielectrics mounds 3 with a single "layer of dielectric", while still maintaining Kobayashi's upper dielectric mounds 3.

Similarly to Arledge, Shimada discloses only a single conductor 31 sandwiched between two dielectrics 33, 34 (see FIG. 9). In light of Kobayashi's teachings, applicants believe that, even if one of ordinary skill in the art *might* have been motivated to replicate the formation of Shimada's dielectric/conductor unit 33, 31, 34 multiple times on a single substrate, there is absolutely no teaching within Shimada or Kobayashi to 1) extend the dielectric 33 of Shimada so that it is capable of supporting multiple conductors 31, or 2) replace *only the lower ones* of Kobayashi's dielectrics mounds 3 with a single "layer of dielectric", while still maintaining Kobayashi's upper dielectric mounds 3.

Of note, Kobayashi does teach an arrangement in FIG. 3 wherein a plurality of conductors 1 are sandwiched between two layers of dielectric 3. However, Kobayashi fails to suggest that this arrangement might be modified to replace *only the top layer* of dielectric with a plurality of dielectric mounds.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are believed to be allowable over the teachings of Arledge, Shimada and Kobayashi for at least the above reasons.

4. Rejection of Claims 3-5, 8 and 16-18 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3-5, 8 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,189; hereinafter "Shimada") in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,357,138).

Applicants assert that claims 3-5, 8 and 16-18 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from either claim 1 or claim 15, which claims are believed to be allowable over the combined teachings of Shimada and Kobayashi for the reasons presented in Section 3 of these Remarks/Arguments, *supra*.

5. Rejection of Claims 9, 19 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 9, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,189; hereinafter "Shimada") in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,357,138) and Dove et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,979; hereinafter "Dove").

Applicants assert that Dove does not teach that which applicants have already argued is missing from the combination of Shimada and Kobayashi. As a result, applicants believe that claims 9, 19 and 20 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from either claim 1 or claim 15, which claims are believed to be allowable over the combined teachings of Shimada and Kobayashi for the reasons presented in Section 3 of these Remarks/Arguments, *supra*.

6. Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks provided herein, applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By:



Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 291-3200